DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 729 EA 016 497

AUTHOR Bartell, Ted; And Others
TITLE Executive Summary, DoDDS Comprehensive Study [of Dependents Schools].
INSTITUTION Advanced Technology, Inc., Reston, VA.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 31 May 83
NOTE 44p.; For related documents, see EA 016 495-498.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Administrative Organization; Educational Facilities; Educational Improvement; Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; *Educational Quality; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Futures (of Society); *Government School Relationship; School Location; Services; Special Education; Special Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Dependents Schools

ABSTRACT

The third volume of a comprehensive study of the Department of Defense Dependents Schools (DoDDS), this report summarizes the overall findings with respect to the five basic issues that the study addressed: educational quality, student progress, resources and facilities, management, and future factors. In the first case, the quality of educational opportunity in DoDDS was found to be higher than that of stateside schools, although the smaller schools may lack diversity, and special education needs are not always met. Student academic progress was found to be well-correlated with student needs and educational expectations, though the high turnover rate results in less school spirit and a more serious, individualistic approach among students. Resources and facilities are in need of repair and replacement, but serve most students well. The organizational structure and management practices of DoDDS, however, need to be improved. The study recommends establishment of a centralized management information system, with district-level supervision of schools, to give principals more time for instructional leadership. Finally, demographic trends, technological advances, and changes in military policy will have major impacts on DoDDS. Related recommendations pertain to accreditation policy, student testing, curriculum development, staff quality, facilities, pupil transportation, student meal program, and issues concerning a proposed transfer of jurisdiction to the Department of Education. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED240729

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DoDDS COMPREHENSIVE STUDY

SOCIAL SCIENCES DIVISION
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY, INC.
RESTON, VIRGINIA

MAY 31, 1983

EA 016 497

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DoDDS COMPREHENSIVE STUDY

TED BARTELL
WARD KEESLING
GENE KELLY
JAY SHOTEL

SOCIAL SCIENCES DIVISION
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY, INC.
RESTON, VIRGINIA

MAY 31, 1983

THE VIEWS, OPINIONS, AND/OR FINDINGS CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHORS AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED AS AN OFFICIAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS SCHOOLS [DoDDS] POSITION, POLICY, OR DECISION, UNLESS SO DESIGNATED BY OTHER OFFICIAL DOCUMENTATION.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

A Comprehensive Study of the Department of Defense Dependents Schools [DoDDS] was mandated by the 96th Congress as part of the 1978 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The general objectives of the study were to determine:

- The extent to which DoDDS offers a broad, equal, and quality educational opportunity to students, and the degree to which these opportunities meet student needs and community expectations
- The extent to which student progress in the development of skills, behaviors, and attitudes is related to student needs and educational expectations
- The degree to which resources and facilities are available, equitably distributed, and effectively utilized to provide quality educational programs in an overseas setting
- The degree to which organizational structure and management practices are appropriate and effective in facilitating the delivery of quality educational programs
- The extent to which DoDDS will be affected by future factors and recent trends in American life, military planning, and host country politics

In April of 1982 Advanced Technology, Inc. and its subcontractors, George Washington University, the University of Southern California, the Center for Studies in Social Policy, and Westinghouse Information Services, were awarded a 14-month competitive contract to conduct this assessment.

STUDY FINDINGS

DoDDS Offers a Quality Educational Opportunity to Most of Its Students.

Although the student population in DoDDS is highly transient compared to that of stateside districts, making the evaluation of DoDDS education difficult, it is possible to conclude that DoDDS offers quality educational opportunities to a majority of students. Most of the tests DoDDS uses that have national norms show that the average scores of DoDDS students are above the averages of their stateside peers. Extensive reanalyses performed on data obtained both in the U.S. and in DoDDS by the High School and Beyond Study show that DoDDS students obtained higher average scores on achievement tests than their stateside counterparts did. Examination of the course-taking patterns of DoDDS and stateside seniors indicates that DoDDS seniors were more likely to meet proposed course requirements for admission to colleges and universities. Generally, the longer the students were exposed to DoDDS schools, the more likely they were to meet these requirements. The test scores and course-taking patterns demonstrate that DoDDS is meeting the needs of most students.

Parents of DoDDS students give more favorable ratings of their schools and teachers than do parents in the United States. These high ratings indicate that the schools are meeting the expectations of their communities.

Two broad exceptions arise to these favorable conclusions:

- Smaller schools (especially high schools) may not be able to offer a sufficient diversity of courses to meet all students' needs. Lower pupil-teacher ratios may

compensate for this to some degree, but there may be a problem of equity that will have to be addressed.

- Students with special needs (gifted and talented, limited-English speaking, those in need of compensatory education, or those seeking vocational education) do not always receive the services they need.

Data from High School and Beyond indicate that students who entered small high schools in DoDDS after the ninth grade seemed to have greater difficulty meeting course requirements for college and university admission than did students entering larger schools at the same time. There is a strong possibility that community expectations for students in academic tracks may not be attainable in small schools, as universities raise their demands for college preparatory courses.

Services for special needs populations have been increased greatly in the last three years. At this time, it is estimated that there are 7,600 limited-English speaking students in the system. There are 88 qualified English as a second language [ESL] teachers. An additional 60 teachers will be involved in certification training sponsored by DoDDS during the summer of 1983. There are 5,000 gifted and talented [TAG] students and, currently, 57 teachers with appropriate training. During the summer of 1983, 24 more gifted and talented teachers will be trained by DoDDS. DoDDS has identified 9,700 students in need of compensatory education and is now serving about half of them. The number of vocational education courses is regarded as barely adequate to meet student needs. Just over half the principals indicate a need for more vocational education staff. DoDDS has requested through the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) budget

procedure, staff resources to meet requirements in these new areas. These resources are projected to be in place by school year 1984-85.

DoDDS has made great progress in providing sufficient staff to offer services for handicapped students; however, as is true in school systems in the U.S., particularly those with rural populations, problems occur with service delivery, although not all of them are directly under DoDDS control. For example, the Air Force and Navy apparently screen families for overseas tours and attempt to assure that services will be available in the locations where handicapped children would go. If related services cannot be provided, the family is not sent to that place. Not all screening has been rigorous and a few children have arrived in situations where services were not readily available. There have not been large numbers of such cases, but each one created a problem both for the system trying to provide services and for the student who had to do without some appropriate services. The Army's new Exceptional Family Member Program will soon encompass all Army families, overseas and in the U.S. All future assignments will consider the level of care required for dependents. As is true in stateside communities, when families become aware of the legal obligation of DoDDS to provide services, the system could be impacted by lawsuits if adequate services are not forthcoming.

In the few examples we studied in some detail, there was no evidence that the Military Occupational Specialty of the military member was so important or rare that he or she was the only

person who could have performed the duties required. Thus, it was neither necessary nor preferable to send the family with a handicapped child to the overseas location in question.

By January 1983 all military services were screening families to ensure that dependents could obtain the services needed on the bases to which they were to be assigned. We recommend that DoD make this screening mandatory.

A related problem is the fact that seriously and profoundly handicapped youngsters tend to be dispersed in the DoDDS system. Contemporary thought suggests that it is best to treat such youngsters in settings where they can relate to a peer group. This may suggest that it would ultimately be best not to attempt to serve children with certain handicaps within DoDDS, unless clustering of age-grouped children with specific low incidence handicaps could be arranged.

Another problem DoDDS faces is the provision of "related services." DoDDS must rely on military hospitals for these services, which engenders additional transportation problems (and expenses) as well as the need to devote considerable attention to coordination, sometimes for a very few cases. Nearly 40 percent of principals said they had problems in securing related services, and of these, more than 60 percent stated that the services were unavailable. Another 10 percent said that transportation to the service was not possible to arrange. This situation should be ameliorated soon in Europe because the Army has identified 125 medical providers for assignments to Europe in the

coming school year. The first team of 36 is scheduled to arrive in Germany during the summer of 1983.

DoDDS has promulgated DoD Instruction 1342.12 to indicate how DoDDS is to implement the content of PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. This instruction has been in effect for just over one year, and DoDDS personnel are still learning how to accomplish some of the requirements. Currently DoDDS is hampered, in part, by the fact that the regions had developed quite independent systems of classifying handicapping conditions prior to the implementation of DoD Instruction 1342.12 in December 1981. Not all of these classifications systems use the same terminology. The regions also specify different assessment mechanisms. ODS has made an effort to forge a consensus from this diversity by developing a systemwide terminology and process.

Using DoDDS' own criteria for implementation, we can see that there is still some way to go to successfully implement these programs. Like many stateside school systems, about one-third of the assessment data reviewed in student folders during site visits was found to be either outdated (test scores that are two years old) or inappropriate (English-language test given to a limited-English speaker). Factors of program availability inappropriately dominated discussions of the needs and placement of students. About 30 percent of students did not have IEPs in November 1982 (subsequent information indicates they were developed later in the year); and in more than half the cases,

the responsibilities for managing the case and documenting the evidence for the IEP were not clearly assigned. IEPs were not always fully implemented due to lack of facilities or staff, lack of an appropriate peer group for treatment, and/or insufficient access to regular classroom settings. In more than half the cases observed, there was no comparable data across years on which to base judgments of progress. However, it should be noted that the mandated program is just in its second year of implementation.

Sixty percent of the special education teachers received inservice training on program implementation, but only half of these received training of at least two days. Only 3 percent of them received training on the functions of the case study committee. These committees have been in existence since 1968, but recently have had the added responsibilities associated with implementing DoD Instruction 1342.12. Only 5 percent of regular classroom teachers had received any training on special education programs. Another problem is that supervision of the special education teachers is left up to the school principal, who may not have particular expertise in those fields.

Germany-South had established Education Service Centers that provide services in support of special education programs in clusters of schools. Each center is located near a military hospital to make access to the center easy for those cases where diagnosis or treatment must be provided in the center. The centers are staffed by specialists and are headed by a psychologist

in several locations. It might be possible to broaden the scope of their mission to include some clinical supervision of specialist teachers, as a supplement to the principal's observations. It is recommended that this intermediate-level unit, between region and school, be given careful consideration as the focus of more of the special education planning and implementation. Staff at such a unit can be much more responsive to the needs of specialist (and regular) teachers than can coordinators in the Regional Office.

Through provisions of the budget planning process, TAG, compensatory education, and ESL are projected to be fully funded and staffed within two years so that DoDDS students with these needs will have the same opportunities for service that they would have stateside. An annual census of the students having these needs should be conducted so that staffing adjustments can be made in a timely fashion. Detailed program guides (available as drafts in two of the areas) should be completed and promulgated. Bringing supporting services closer to the schools (as in the Educational Service Center model), rather than having them at Regional Headquarters, would provide for a more responsive system of service delivery, as well as more direct supervision of the teachers in the program. Vocational program offerings should be expanded to be more responsive to the needs of particular age groups and to correspond to the most comprehensive and up-to-date information about employment opportunities.

As with special education, there are instances where due to the small size of the school few students are in need of a

particular service. This leads to situations in which students get help from aides or itinerant teachers who cannot provide much continuity of service. Despite these shortfalls, access to these programs has improved markedly in the last few years and provisions for increased services are in the FY84 budget. About half the schools have a TAG specialist now, compared with just over 10 percent 2 years a o. ESL specialists are now present in half the schools, compared to 25 percent 2 years ago. Compensatory education services are provided by remedial reading teachers in 80 percent of the schools (up from 67 percent 2 years ago).

Student Academic Progress Is Related to Student Needs and to Educational Expectations.

Generally speaking, students and teachers agree that the students in DoDDS classes are as well prepared as students who arrive from the states. In fact, the differences in average test scores mentioned earlier indicate that stateside students are behind their DoDDS peers.

The analyses of the High School and Beyond data indicate that students in the states and in DoDDS had similar attitudes to work, family, community, and self. They were equally likely to have engaged in antisocial behaviors at school.

DoDDS students seemed to regard their teachers as less interested in them and felt that there was less school spirit than did seniors in stateside schools. These perceptions may be due, in part, to the continual turnover of students within grade cohorts. Students were, however, more attentive to the tests and

questionnaires they filled out as part of the High School and Beyond Study.

These similarities and differences probably indicate a slightly more serious atmosphere in DoDDS schools. The attitudes of DoDDS students did not seem to be related to the characteristics of their educational programs. The study found no evidence suggesting that the particular attitudes or behaviors of DoDDS students interfere with their educational progress to a greater or lesser extent than those of their stateside contemporaries.

Resources and Facilities Are in Need of Repair and Replacement but Serve Most of the Students Well.

DoDDS has recognized that its generally older school plant is in need of repair and replacement and has devoted considerable effort to these tasks since obtaining authority for these activities in 1978. One of the difficulties faced by DoDDS is that even for minor construction (less than $100,000) the period from inception of the idea to completion is at least 20 months. This carries over more than one annual funding cycle and makes it necessary to engage in long-range planning, a task for which most school administrators are not well trained.

In addition, many principals did not have copies of the contract that governed the services they were to receive (e.g., routine maintenance, custodial care). There were many ways of arranging for and vouchering these services in some areas (when more than one branch of the military was involved).

There were some hazards that had not been corrected and disruptions to educational programs, but these were in the minority. DoDDS does seem to be skimping on classroom space. The size specified on average is larger for elementary schools and smaller for middle school, junior high, and high school and for special purpose rooms on a per child basis than the typical stateside guidelines. The acreage on which to site schools is also smaller than stateside. The latter difference is probably a result of having to site most schools on base to avoid lengthy negotiations with the host nations. DoDDS should reexamine its guidelines regarding size of classrooms.

Because the majority of classes for handicapped students have recently been established, facilities to accommodate students with special needs are lagging behind the general availability of classroom space. Staffing levels are up, but space problems exist. DoDDS serves the average student adequately to well, but more effort should be directed to serving students with special needs. DoDDS emphasized such needs in its 1982 facilities planning cycle for all future years.

DoDDS' Organizational Structure and Management Practices Need to Be Improved.

DoDDS costs were within the range of comparison districts in the United States. Cost data on DoDDS program elements was not available in all instances. DoDDS uses systems of the three military departments for recording obligations and expenditures. Our recommendations stemming from this finding agree with those of the General Accounting Office [GAO]:

- DoDDS should continue their efforts to develop accounting and internal management control systems as required by the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.
- DoDDS should continue their efforts to use a uniform financial coding system applicable to DoDDS activities worldwide.
- DoDDS should continue work to streamline procedures for recording disbursements in the school system's accounting records.
- DoDDS should return to the reimbursable concept in obtaining logistics support services.
- DoDDS should continue their efforts to ensure that all Interservice Support Agreements are up to date and that they contain specific detail on costs and expected performance.
- DoDDS should provide principals with training in fiscal matters.

Current efforts to standardize the information gathered is an essential first step in obtaining a comprehensive understanding of costs in the system. Once these are understood, they can be used to make more sophisticated projections about the resource needs of DoDDS in the preparation of budget requests.

Another key element is the establishment of a management information system [MIS] that supports strategic planning, management control, and operational functions. DoDDS has initiated an MIS design effort that concentrates first on a complete analysis of the management information needs or requirements of the DoDDS program. In a school system the evaluation of educational programs should be well supported. Data on the performance of the system are essential to the managerial tasks of planning and controlling. We propose that the Evaluation Branch be made a

Division, that it be closely connected to the management information system to be established, and that it expand its activities beyond the educational aspects of the system.

The study found that staff in Regional Offices are too far away from schools to provide the kind of supervision and assistance to principals and teachers that would be most useful. It is essential that a subregional or district-level organization be established to provide for more direct supervision of schools. The establishment of 20 District Offices is proposed, each supervising and providing administrative/management support to approximately 10-15 schools. Principals in a district would report to the District Administrator, who would report to the Regional Director.

In order to do this without expanding the number of above-school personnel in DoDDS, a reduction in the number of regions from five to three is proposed. We propose that the Atlantic, Mediterranean, and Panama regions be merged. Additional savings of personnel would be realized by reducing the size of the Headquarters Office [ODS].

The net effect of these proposals would be to make ODS the major planning and policy setting body in DoDDS. Information would come to ODS through a uniform reporting system that would provide a sound basis for planning and budgeting. ODS currently establishes policy and prepares guidelines for implementing those policies. There is a monitoring function to assure compliance. Operations would continue to be decentralized, to the extent possible, to the three regions and from them to the districts.

Since the locus of most operations is at the school buildings, the District Offices should be located to optimize the availability of resources to school personnel. This would provide a vehicle for reducing the excessive managerial burden on principals and allow them to once again become the educational leaders in their buildings. Supervision of principals and assistance for them (e.g., regarding logistics) would be much more convenient. A basically sound school system can be markedly improved by taking such action.

Demographic Trends, Technological Advances, and Changes in Military Policy Will Have Major Impacts on DoDDS.

Several demographic factors will contribute to increased DoDDS enrollment and increased demands on DoDDS services during the next several years. Numbers of women with young children in the labor force and in the military are expected to increase. The minority composition of the DoDDS school population is expected to increase. Larger proportions of limited-English-proficient [LEP] military members and dependents can be anticipated. Each of these factors will place an increasing strain on current DoDDS programs and services for special needs students. Increasing proportions of married military members with children may create a demand for preschool education in DoDDS, while the increasing number of military members selected with lower levels of educational attainment may produce increased pressures for DoDDS-sponsored adult education for military members and spouses.

A number of recent technological advances are of substantial importance to DoDDS. The use of microcomputers for instruction

and administrative/management functions will become commonplace in many school systems in the next few years. Computer literacy training for staff at all DoDDS levels is ongoing and is considered an essential activity. Selection of educational software is facilitated in DoDDS by the use of the Microsift clearinghouse procedure in the review of rapidly increasing amounts of this material. DoDDS should continue to investigate the feasibility of using computer telecommunications networks as communication links among its subunits.

Finally, changes in military policy and planning will have a significant impact on DoDDS during the next several years. Such changes as the new regimental manning system, ongoing force modernization, and forward stationing will contribute to a continued overall growth in DoDDS enrollment and shifting concentrations of students for at least a few years. Increasing numbers of more highly trained technical personnel to man some of these new systems will likely result in more accompanied tours and larger numbers of school-age dependents. Analyses presented in this report show that military members' intentions to re-enlist and their willingness to accept other overseas tours are significantly related to perceptions of the quality of DoDDS schooling.

RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS

Educational Quality

One way in which DoDDS assures the overall quality of its educational offerings and their comparability to those of

stateside districts is participation in the accreditation activity of the North Central Association [NCA]. All of the DoDDS high schools have been through the initial accreditation review, which involves preparation of a self-assessment and an extensive site visit by a team of people representing NCA. A majority of the DoDDS elementary schools have also been reviewed and accredited. These reviews are conducted on a five-year cycle, with a requirement for an annual update between each visit. Not only does the school under review obtain valuable insight into its operation, but the entire system benefits from having a reference group of states and districts to use for comparison. (See, for example, DoDDS vs. NCA: How do we really compare?, prepared by the Evaluation Branch of DoDDS.)

The NCA process is relatively expensive. The visitation team is composed of members from NCA districts stateside as well as a member from each of two other DoDDS regions. All of their TDY (travel plus one week on site) must be paid for by DoDDS. We recommend that this be continued.

For small schools currently exempt from NCA visits (elementary and junior high schools with fewer than 150 students and high schools with less than 100 students), we recommend that a local group composed of parents and some staff prepare a statement evaluating the school by NCA standards.

Student Testing

Testing is another means by which DoDDS assures the quality of education it delivers. Systemwide evaluation activities include the use of items from the National Assessment of

Educational Progress [NAEP], participation in the High School and Beyond Study, and the Systemwide Testing Program [STP]. Using items from the National Assessment of Educational Progress allows DoDDS to make comparisons of its students to national samples of students. Since the National Assessment repeats content areas from time to time, trend data can also be examined. The NAEP program uses standardized forms and testing procedures. DoDDS has participated twice in the NAEP. In the first instance, 1978-79, the writing assessment items were selected from NAEP and scored primarily for mechanics by DoDDS teachers. In 1979-80, DoDDS participated fully in the NAEP writing assessment to gain a more complete and comparative picture of the writing ability of DoDDS students and also participated in the literature assessment. NAEP procedures were followed as to sampling, materials used, and test administration and scoring by NAEP to ensure comparability of DoDDS results with those of NAEP.

In 1980 a longitudinal study of the seniors and sophomores in the nation's high schools was initiated. This study--High School and Beyond--tested the basic skills and aptitudes and administered questionnaires on family background, aspirations, etc., to over 58,000 students. Information was also collected on the schools and on some of the families of these students. DoDDS replicated the student assessment in its own schools but did not collect any of the related school or family data. Nevertheless, this is the most complete study of any group of DoDDS students. DoDDS is presently participating in the follow-up surveys of these students.

These activities give DoDDS important opportunities to compare the performance of its students to their stateside peers. Unfortunately, the lack of large capacity computers in the DoDDS system has somewhat restricted its internal capabilities for secondary analysis of the data. Both of these studies have been the source of much analysis and speculation stateside. DoDDS has utilized the results in briefing papers and has provided requested secondary analysis through cooperative work with the Defense Manpower Data Center.

The Systemwide Testing Program occurs in the fall in grades 4, 6, 7, 9, 11. The test presently in use is prepared to DoDDS specifications by a nationally recognized publisher of standardized tests (CTB/McGraw-Hill). The test was used for the first time in the fall of 1982, and the responses to our questions were obtained during its initial implementation.

The STP is to serve several functions. It is referenced to the objectives that DoDDS specifies in its curriculum guidelines, and it has norms that allow comparisons to be made to the performance of students in the United States. It can be used as the basis for forming instructional groupings in the classrooms, and it provides insight about the strengths and weaknesses of the students that can influence the curricular emphases in a given classroom. There are, however, two problems with this program: the preparation of school staff to use the test results and the timeliness of the receipt of student reports.

Eighty percent of the principals in the system had received training on the interpretation and use of STP data. This percentage varied somewhat by region, with the Mediterranean being somewhat lower and Panama and the two Germany Regions being higher. Seventy percent of the principals said that their teachers had received training on the STP, but only 40 percent of the teachers (in the same schools) said they received such inservice as of October 1982. The Pacific and Atlantic Regions were higher in teacher training than the other regions. Larger percentages of teachers (averaging 61 percent) reported having copies of DoDDS materials intended to help them interpret STP results. Our data collection occurred between the time the test was given (September) and the receipt of the results in the field (mid to late November). Some of the principals were awaiting receipt of results before distributing the DoDDS guidelines for interpretation.

Many teachers expressed concerns about the timeliness of the test results. Even though CTB/McGraw-Hill was reported to be returning results well ahead of the dates of delivery of the previous contractor, results received in November allow a lot of instructional time to pass in the absence of information about the performance levels of the students. Teachers (especially in lower grades) wanted information sooner to help them form instructional groupings in their classrooms. There was also concern that the school was not able to guide its own curricular emphases for nearly two months because the information was not available.

Most school districts in the United States test in the spring (some test in the fall and spring) in order to assess what has been taught during the school year. DoDDS is fairly unique in emphasizing the fall input over the spring outcome. Because of the fairly large numbers of new students each year, DoDDS schools do not get a clear assessment of how well they performed the previous year's instruction. This would be especially valuable information for planning the emphases at a particular grade level. Determining emphases from the fall test data may lead one to overemphasize instruction in areas that appear weak. The instruction that would normally have been provided might have been enough to accomplish the task. Examinations of spring test data can reveal where the curriculum was not effective in the previous year. For those new students entering the DoDDS system in the fall, however, STP data would not be available.

We recommend that DoDDS continue to utilize items from the National Assessment exercises and that participation in the follow-ups to High School and Beyond be fully funded. We also suggest that DoDDS' Evaluation Branch obtain the hardware and expertise to permit secondary analyses of these data.

In addition, DoDDS should continue the STP. Serious consideration should be given to changing the test to the spring. If this is still deemed undesirable, additional analyses should be conducted each year to separate the new students from those who were present in the previous year. Teachers should be encouraged to find alternative mechanisms for grouping students.

Efforts to give principals and teachers training in how to use the test results to develop grade-level plans for improving the curriculum should continue. Germany-South had developed the notion of the school "Action Plan" describing the ways in which the curriculum would be improved. This seems fundamentally sound and could be exported to the other regions if the test data can be reported in a timely fashion. The users of tests for this purpose should be warned that a test is only a sampling from the curriculum, and excessive shaping of the curriculum to the test can lead to an undesirable narrowing of focus.

Curriculum Development Plan

DoDDS has also instituted a Five-Year Curriculum Development Plan to ensure that each curricular area is reviewed systematically. There are three phases to this effort. In the first year of review samples of teachers, principals, parents, and students are surveyed to determine what is effective and ineffective about the present curriculum in a given area (e.g., science). The regional coordinators for that subject area meet to review the survey results and determine whether the curriculum guidelines should be revised.

They also initiate the second phase by making a first, broad selection of instructional materials purveyed by publishers. Those selected are supposed to cover the objectives set out in the guidelines. They are then pilot tested (for less than a full academic year, usually) by volunteer schools in the system. The pilot test does not focus on achievement data--there are usually

too few schools to provide a valid indication of differential effects. Rather, the data focus on the ease with which teachers can use the materials in the classroom and their acceptance by the students and school administrators. On the basis of this study, an interim selection of materials is made, usually about three to five texts and associated materials. After regional committees and coordinators review the data, regional recommendations are submitted to the ODS task group; consensus is achieved, and a recommendation for systemwide adoption is submitted to the Director, DoDDS. The approved listing, which frequently includes more than one title for an area, is then provided to schools for a schoolwide selection to be made by teachers. In some cases, a single title is selected from the approved list by a region as its adoption. There is little evidence to suggest that children experience great difficulties if they change text series from one grade level to another (at the same school, or because they change schools). Indeed, if the teachers followed the DoDDS Scope and Sequence, the only problem would be if a text did not cover all of the relevant material. The selection process presumably eliminates this possibility. Some teachers, however, indicated that in changing schools (within a region) they had difficulty familiarizing themselves with materials they had not selected. This was most notably a problem with science where publishers prepared very different kits of materials for use in demonstrations.

Two other problems were noted by teachers in the selection of materials and their use in the classroom. Some teachers reported they had very little time to review the publisher's offerings (e.g., 20 minutes during a break at an inservice meeting) and that the publishers had usually provided only rudimentary inservice regarding the use of the materials (one-half day spent pointing out that a teacher's manual could be consulted to answer each question).

Generally speaking, the Five-Year Curriculum Development Plan permits the selection of materials that meet the needs of DoDDS students, although teachers cited career education and the newly established areas of computer science and vocational education as deficient on our survey. DoDDS has recently purchased a substantial number of microcomputers for installation in the schools, so the problem with computer science materials may be alleviated in the future.

Requiring a uniform cycle for the review of all curriculum areas may not be optimal. It is not likely that the English curriculum or foreign language curriculum will change fundamentally in the next several years, for example. The cycle in these areas could be extended to seven or eight years (or longer) with the proviso that as microcomputers become more available, supplementary "courseware" in these fields be reviewed systematically. Plans would also have to be made to periodically provide additional texts to the schools to replace worn-out books. Other areas, such as computer science, are changing so rapidly that it

may be reasonable to institute continuous monitoring or shorten the cycle (to three years, for example).

Staff Quality

Another strong influence on the quality of education is the quality of staff. Respondents to our surveys generally have high regard for the teaching staff. The exceptions may merely be evidence supporting the maxim, "You can't please all the people all the time." Most school systems have a difficult time removing a teacher for lack of competence, and DoDDS is no different. It can be done, but it takes careful documentation of all interactions with the teacher for a period of one or two years. Stateside districts (and DoDDS) sometimes just move the person around so the grief is shared equally. DoDDS should initiate disciplinary and other measures consistent with applicable personnel procedures and union contracts to either improve performance or remove the 7 percent of teachers rated by principals as being below average or poor.

There was little difference in quality perceived between CONUS hires and local hires (dependent spouses). The slight favoring of CONUS hires may reflect the fact that they sometimes fill a need that simply cannot be met in the local community (e.g., one person who can teach both mathematics and a foreign language). The major problem principals had with hiring from among dependents was the fact that the substitute pool could become depleted rapidly. Many principals said they had found excellent teachers in their communities and liked the fact that

they could interview them before hiring them. Some dependent hires did move back to the states at awkward times, making it necessary to restructure assignments in a school or find a "permanent substitute" quickly. It is unlikely that requiring separate return dates for the military member and the spouse would be a satisfactory arrangement for the families, although it might help the schools with this awkward problem. Another possibility might be to delay the rotation until the end of the school year. This might be a very low priority consideration for the military in trying to optimize the performance of its military mission, however.

Some of the CONUS hires have settled into the communities in which they are located and are very contented with their existence overseas. Others say that they are losing contact with the United States but feel there are not enough mechanisms to allow them to return to the U.S. for a short period and then resume teaching in DoDDS (especially in a desirable location). There are probably teachers in the United States who would welcome a short tour in DoDDS if they could return to an assured position at home. The Canadian armed forces provide an interesting solution to this problem. They have arranged that certain districts in Canada send teachers to their overseas schools for two years. They continue to be paid and to accrue tenure as if they were still at home. At the end of the period the teacher returns to a job in the original district. This allows for a certain refreshment of the teaching pool overseas and may establish lines of

communication that overseas teachers can use to explore job opportunities at home (something many of them feel is very hard to do). We recommend that DoDDS experiment with this type of agreement to determine its costs and benefits. DoDDS might also try to work this arrangement in reverse--send a DoDDS teacher to the United States for a short tour (not to exceed two years), with a guaranteed return into DoDDS. Some districts might be willing to cooperate in an exchange program trading stateside and DoDDS teachers on a one-for-one basis. It might also benefit DoDDS to explore ways to accumulate and disseminate information about openings in the United States so that teachers who want to return to the states can compete effectively for such positions. This might also free up some positions for transfers or new hires.

The needs for inservice training are currently identified by means of annual survey-based assessments made at the school level in each region. School requests for training of groups or individuals are served in several ways. Groups may be inserviced by regional staff in the school setting or in sessions designed for them away from the school. Individuals may also be served by a regional staff person or they may be selected to receive DoDDS support to attend accredited university sessions offered in the U.S. or overseas, if the course work is directly job related. The ODS office sponsors summer workshops at campuses in the U.S. These workshops offer university credit for training in areas of systemwide priority and programs which are structured for

certification in high-need teaching areas (e.g., gifted and talented, ESL).

There are some potential problems with the availability of inservice offerings, however. It is not clear that the formal procedures DoDDS specifies for an annual survey of inservice needs is fully operational or effective in all regions. Nearly 30 percent of teachers were dissatisfied with inservice policies, and nearly 20 percent said that inservice workshops were not beneficial. Although they are allowed summer home leave for study at the end of each two year tour of duty, teachers said that the most negative aspect of their jobs was the lack of opportunities for further education (as distinct from inservices). It is not necessary for such opportunities to lead to a particular degree, but DoDDS should assist teachers with meeting the recertification requirements. Since the system needs teachers who are capable of filling more than one role, it is recommended that the offerings be courses that would allow teachers to obtain a certification for an additional specialization. It is clear that a comprehensive program of inservice and college-level courses would be expensive to implement on a systemwide basis. But we believe that this would be preferable to the more hit-and-miss aspects of the present system. The costs of such programs would almost certainly be outweighed by having a better prepared, more adaptable corps of teachers.

Another aspect of maintaining a good staff is the role of the principal as instructional leader, supervisor, and evaluator.

The data from this study strongly suggest that DoDDS principals, like their stateside counterparts, consider themselves as building managers with many and diverse demands on their time. Principals do rate the roles of instructional leader, supervisor, and evaluator highly and indicate that they devote considerable time to them and, like their stateside counterparts, think that they should devote even more time than they do. Nearly a quarter of the DoDDS principals indicated a desire for additional training in supervision. This gap between ideal performance and reality is reflected by the teachers' ratings of supervision by their principals. Sizable proportions of the teachers are observed only once or twice each year by the principals, and many teachers state that they do not receive any feedback on their teaching.

The principal's role as an evaluator of teachers is guided in DoDDS by the relatively new performance appraisal system. Given the complexities and subtleties of teaching, the difficulties of specifying standards of measurement, and the newness of the system, it is not surprising that the study found mixed reviews of its functioning and effectiveness. It would be inappropriate at this point to interpret these results as supporting radical changes to the system, however. The system is a major step toward formalizing and strengthening a key role of the principals in DoDDS and it deserves sustained attention by administrators, principals, and teachers. Given the need for training expressed by principals, DoDDS should increase training for principals and should encourage dialogue and input from teachers about the process.

Quality of Facilities

The quality of the physical facilities in which instruction must take place can influence the delivery of educational services. Overall, the facilities operated by DoDDS are in satisfactory, but aging, condition. As of 1981 about half the classrooms had been constructed before 1960, and nearly 20 percent were in buildings designed for purposes other than schooling. Eighteen percent of the principals reported that hazardous conditions recurred and were not properly tended. Twenty percent of the principals reported they had to make frequent adjustment to class schedules, class size, and teaching assignments because of delays in obtaining repairs or maintenance. There is a clear need for new construction and for sufficient programs of maintenance.

DoDDS was delegated authority and responsibility for the construction program in 1978 and has responded to construction needs by increasing budgets annually. In the five years since, DoDDS has had $207 million in new construction approved (compared with $101.5 million expended in the previous decade). The maintenance budget has risen from $8 million annually to $20 million in the same time. A current 5-year plan for construction is valued at $500 million. Despite the increasing allocations to these activities, there are some problems with the way in which the activities are conducted that may cause problems in the future.

One problem with new construction is obtaining suitable sites. Less than 20 percent of DoDDS schools are on sites of the size recommended for stateside facilities, even though DoDDS policies recommend acreage that compares well with stateside guidelines. If a site cannot be found on a base or other land under U.S. control, then complex negotiations must be entered into with the host government. One project was delayed for 13 years for such negotiations. It may be expeditious to take a smaller site on a base. But such a site may not always be well located (proximity to runways being one bad example). There is no easy solution to this problem, and it may mean that the schools in the system will always be perceived as having less than adequate playing fields and playgrounds.

Another possible problem has to do with the size of schools. The average of the range of DoDDS guidelines for general purpose classrooms specifies larger rooms than the stateside average. DoDDS recommendations for special purpose rooms tend to be smaller than stateside counterparts. Guidelines for total square footage per student are higher than stateside at the elementary level by 7 percent but lower at the secondary level by 16 percent and at the junior high/middle school level by 13 percent, most likely because of the allowances for special purpose rooms.

In order to allow its construction budget to go as far as possible, and in order to contain costs, DoDDS is enforcing the

minimum guidance as the maximum allowable footage for planning purposes. DoDDS is also insisting that plans be developed around defensible student enrollment projections. This can cause a problem in working with the military commander (a person especially important if the school is to be built on the base), who is authorized to plan construction based on projected manpower. It may be difficult to resolve disagreements between DoDDS' and local projections. If there is a growing demand for classroom space, DoD Directive 1342.6 tasks the military commander to provide adequate facilities for the educational program. DoDDS does insist that schools be planned for expansion if needed, but this requires going back to the construction budget (or minor construction budget) for another approval at a date that may be too late to meet the initial need.

While projecting student enrollments several years in advance is not easy, DoDDS should reconsider its policy of planning and the defense of its plans to military commanders. DoDDS should also reconsider the guidance it gives concerning classroom size, particularly as regards small schools and the algorithms for special purpose rooms. There was only one school where it was reported to have adversely affected educational services, but this may only be an early indicator of a serious problem that will develop later.

DoDDS should also augment the DoD Construction Criteria that guide all military construction with an educational specifications supplement relating to school construction. One Regional Office has prepared such a document that could serve as a model.

A regional based approach for presentation of the specifications may be appropriate.

A further recommendation is that ODS involve the regional facilities specialists more in the prioritizing and budget allocations for construction. These individuals have training and experience in engineering, construction, and maintenance of schools and were found to be highly respected by those in the military with whom they deal. They are, however, often caught between base commanders who want larger facilities and the constraints imposed by ODS. If the regional specialists were more fully informed of how the decision making process for the worldwide construction budget impacts their region they might be better equipped to answer the questions raised in the military communities in which they work.

New construction valued at less than $200,000 and repair and maintenance services are funded under the Operations and Maintenance [O&M] budget of DoDDS. The services are provided through the military, which charges DoDDS funds directly. DoDDS negotiates Interservice Support Agreements [ISAs] with the military services for the provision of recurring O&M services. There are 141 ISAs in effect, ranging from services for a school complex to worldwide services. The study identified several problems with this process.

At the start of this study about 44 percent of the ISAs had lapsed. Since that time all but 9 percent have been renegotiated. During the time ISAs are lapsed the military services continue to provide services as under the prior agreement.

Designated lead principals (complex coordinators) negotiate and administer ISAs and contracts issued under the ISAs. What was found was that most have delegated monitoring responsibilities to the principals in their complex who are not privy to the details spelled out in the ISA or contract. Thus, only 33 percent of the principals have copies of all the contracts describing the services their schools are to receive, and another third have no documentation whatever relating to these services. This discrepancy should be corrected with the implementation of DoDDS' school level management information system.

Apparently the need for maintenance of the DoDDS facilities is outstripping the budget, even though that has been increased greatly. About 33 percent of the schools reported that their full request for minor construction or nonrecurring maintenance and repair had not been approved. Even when approval is obtained, the service may not be provided in a timely fashion. Half of the base engineers reported having problems meeting school needs in the area of minor construction. Half of these engineers identified the funding cycle as the source of the problem, and 40 percent identified the very short lead time between authorization and completion date. These problems are actually connected and point up a need for long-range planning for minor construction. In Germany the entire cycle from school identification, design, Regional Office and ODS approval, and procurement of contractor to completion of project requires 20 months. Some Regional Offices have taken to preparing design

specifications for several projects which can then be submitted for approval when the funding cycle permits.

In the area of minor construction, we recommend that DoDDS initiate a planning program that will mesh with the DoD resource management regulations that govern the activities of military engineering offices. As for other services provided to schools from O&M funds, we recommend that DoDDS establish standard procedures for monitoring the delivery of the services. The current policy that complex coordinators monitor the services that schools are authorized to receive does not appear to be fully implemented. We recommend that such monitoring activity be placed at a level between region and school, such as the proposed District Offices discussed earlier.

Pupil Transportation

The transportation of pupils to and from school, on field trips, and to extracurricular events is a service provided to DoDDS on a reimbursable basis by the military communities in which the schools are located. These services are reported to be fully supportive of the core educational program but are seen as less supportive of field trips and extracurricular events. There are two main issues with the transportation provided: cost and safety.

Transportation of pupils accounts for fully 10 percent of the DoDDS budget, compared to an estimated 5 percent among stateside districts. It is very hard to obtain reliable data on the reasons for the differential costs because each ISA covering transportation is different from the others and there is no

standard for keeping records on the utilization or costs of the service. It seems that in DoDDS the buses travel farther per pupil in a year and that the cost per mile is also higher compared to stateside districts. Our recommendation is to continue to work toward uniform reporting of costs and services so that accurate assessments of expenditures can be made. These guidelines should be promulgated by DoD for use by all military commands performing this service.

DoDDS-wide currently there are only three qualified staff members to evaluate transportation programs, one at the ODS level. We believe that optimizing local school bus routes, making trade-offs between contracted services versus direct hire, etc., cannot be monitored effectively from Washington. We recommend that this function be adequately staffed at a level between the school and the regions.

The safety of the bus rider is not a question of the condition of the bus or the nature of the route so much as it is the lack of monitoring on the buses. Nearly a fourth of the older students we interviewed reported that fighting or indecency were problems on the buses they rode. Sometimes arguments started on the buses were carried into the schools. Students who reported that discipline was good on their buses attributed it to control by the driver or a monitor. Like many stateside systems, DoDDS is not authorized to hire or pay monitors for school buses. Neither is the military. The exception to this is when host national laws require monitoring. In some cases military commanders assign parents to monitoring duties; in other cases there

is a volunteer program (parents may ride part of the way to and from their work), or a booster club pays for salaried monitors.

Approximately 40 percent of all students ride unmonitored buses. Parents and principals see some potential for problems in this lack (although this varies considerably by region). A systemwide, funded school bus monitoring program does not appear to be justified, although small-scale projects in areas where trouble has been experienced may be justified. Volunteer monitoring programs should be actively encouraged throughout the system. This can be done by disseminating information about the successful volunteer programs that already exist. One caveat to this is that it is unclear who becomes liable in case an injury is attributable to the volunteer monitor. A clear policy needs to be developed for this contingency. To the extent that volunteer programs can fill this need, the costs to DoDDs should be negligible.

Student Meal Program

While student feeding is the responsibility of the local military community rather than DoDDS, parents see the program as one of the biggest school-related problems. Parents of more than half of the students who participate in lunch programs are displeased with the service, complaining that often only cold lunches are provided or there are problems with the quality of the food.

The availability of a student lunch program depends upon the military community the school serves. Such programs are not the

responsibility of DoDDS and are not to be subsidized by either the military community or DoDDS. The meal services are arranged through the food service organization serving the military installation. This is a continuation of the policy not to duplicate services provided through other agencies. Indeed, many of the schools that were built when the military had responsibility for the construction program lack lunch facilities. Just under half of the schools in DoDDS have on-site cafeterias, although all new construction is required to include plans for a cafeteria. At the time of the study 75 percent of the schools had some arrangement in place to provide lunch. Sometimes this involves the children taking lunch at the Base/PX Cafeteria, the Officers and NCO clubs, or the Dependents Youth Activity. Not all the arrangements are congenial. One elementary school we visited has such a large enrollment that it must feed children in shifts in the auditorium/gym and in the main hallway. Knowing that they did not have an adequate facility, they resisted the imposition of the program for a time, but the community commander compelled their participation. The principal described the number of meetings needed to work out the schedule and details of the program as having preempted educational planning at the start of the school year.

There is probably no quick fix to this problem. As new construction comes on stream the proportion of schools with food service facilities will grow, and it should be possible to provide hot lunches to larger proportions of the students. This

should alleviate many of the complaints about the service that occur at present.

Current legislation allows eligible DoD dependents to participate in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's free and reduced price lunch program. This participation must be negotiated between the school, the military community, and the food service organization serving that community. Congress has considered modifying the legislation to exclude DoDDS children, but the data available in this study suggest that the level of eligibility may approach that of stateside schools. A more detailed study should be performed before this benefit is arbitrarily removed.

ISSUES CONCERNING PROPOSED TRANSFER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

In the legislation enacted in 1979, creating the Department of Education, one section of that law stipulated that within three years of the time the Department was created the overseas schools operated for dependents of U.S. military personnel were to be transferred to the new Department of Education [ED]. With the creation of the Department in May 1980, that transfer was scheduled to have taken place no later than May of 1983. At the time the Department of Defense issued the request for proposals in connection with this study it was assumed by all parties, including the contractors, that the question of the organizational location of the DoD schools would have been decided prior to the release of this study. However, in an amendment included in the FY83 DoD Authorization Bill (enacted in the closing days

of the 97th Congress), a stipulation was included which extends the scheduled transfer date for one year until May 1984. It is, therefore, clear that this issue will be before the Congress at the time this report is issued.

Because of the interest which this subject has generated, information has been gathered and is presented in this report, which may illuminate the discussion on the potential transfer. The current administration has proposed legislation which would negate the transfer and retain the DoD schools within the Department of Defense. However, this is a subject of some controversy, since those who supported the enactment of the Department believe the transfer should occur as directed in the Department of Education Organization Act.

Since neither the original request for proposal nor contractor responses addressed this issue, both the research plan and the data collection efforts associated with this contract were not directed at seeking information on this issue nor in dealing with recommendations regarding the proposed transfer. However, it was felt that the importance of this issue to the Congress and to those students, faculty, and administrators affiliated with the dependents schools mandated that all appropriate and available information gathered during this study be presented in a manner which might illuminate any further consideration of this issue.

The interviews conducted in the field produced a number of expressions of interest and concern regarding the proposed

transfer which Congress may wish to consider during debate on this issue. These concerns are arrayed below:

Educational

- What would the impact of a transfer be on the quality of programs for target populations (special education, ESL, etc.)? Would placement in ED result in greater emphasis on these programs, and/or better quality services?

- Would ED be able to arrange for adequate contracted services to support the following functions which are supplied by or through one or more branches of the Department of Defense?

  - Supply ordering and shipment
  - Personnel and payroll
  - Repair and minor remodeling
  - Transportation
  - Food services

- What impact would a transfer have on the provision of student lunch programs since in all cases they are provided by or through arrangement with the military commander?

- How would the resolution of discipline problems be handled? Would commanders continue to have authority to sanction extreme behavior occurring on school grounds? If not, where would the authority lie?

- Would the relationship between schools and community command become more adversarial since two agencies with different missions would be involved? Would this juxtaposition of missions improve quality of education or stagnate the process?

- Can an organization (ED) have mixed missions (i.e., the delivery of aid through grants and the operation of schools)?

Organization

- What would the impact of a transfer be on the status of forces agreements which exist in each nation where DoDDS schools are located? Would the school system, independent of DoD, have host national hiring quotas? Who would supervise them?

- Would a transfer cause significant disruption in the system?

- How would operation of the schools by ED assure that the military mission of the schools would be met?

- If the schools are transferred, how can their integral relationship to the military community be maintained?

- What lines of authority would exist after a transfer? For example, if hostile activities were expected in a particular area, would the local military commander have the authority to order the evacuation of the schools? Would such an order have to go from DoD to ED in D.C. and back to the school?

- If services such as supplies, personnel, and housing were arranged by contract between ED and DoD, who would arbitrate disputes? How would daily problems be resolved?

- Would teachers or ED employees be denied access to PXs, commissaries, and other base facilities? How would health care for staff be provided?

- What would be the financial impact of the school system having to provide/arrange for those services now provided on a nonreimbursable basis by the military (e.g., medical and dental services for students, transportation on military shuttle, communications, Schools Officer)?